UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/805,233	03/22/2004	Wen-Cheng Tseng	58268.00370	9041	
32294 7590 08/29/2007 SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P. 14TH FLOOR			EXAMINER		
			SORRELL, ERON J		
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2182		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/29/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/805,233	TSENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eron J. Sorrell	2182	

	Eron J. Sorrell	2182					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>07 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o e with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th					
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	acalica				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.11	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		II be entered and an e	explanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	of be entered and necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	is to provide a				
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	red.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consid because: See Continuation Sheet.	ered but does NOT place the appli	cation in condition for	allowance				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments are not persuasive. See attached sheet .

Application/Control Number: 10/805,233 Page 2

Art Unit: 2182

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/7/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues:

- 1) The combination of Egbert and Chieng fails to teach determining from a header whether any default value of the network device should be updated and fetching at least one configuration instruction from a memory when the determining step determines that the network device should be updated (see lines 1-5 of page 6);
- 2) The combination fails to teach the configuration interpreter is configured to interpret the received configuration instructions such that the corresponding values are mapped to corresponding default values of the register file (see lines 4-6 of page 8);
- 3) Gates fails to teach determining a key value from a header and comparing the key value with a predefined key in the network device (see lines 1-2 of page 12).

As per argument 1, the Examiner disagrees. Egbert teaches a network device (item 10, figure 1) that receives configuration instructions from an external memory device (item 14, figure 1). Egbert further teaches reading a header (MSB) from a location in the external memory to determine if any values in the network

Art Unit: 2182

device are to be updated. If the header (MSB) is a 0, an address is read from the memory. This address corresponds to the address in the network device to be updated. The next value in the external memory is read, which corresponds to data to be written to address previously identified. Applicant's claimed configuration instruction is being interpreted as the data read from the external memory and programmed into the network device.

As per argument 2, the Examiner disagrees. Egbert teaches the network device comprises a memory interface (item 16, figure 1) that receives configuration instructions (see lines 26-42 of column 3). The addresses read from the external memory (item 14, figure 1) are mapped to the register file in the network device (item 12, figure 1). The network device reads the internal memory and interprets what registers to reprogram and what data to reprogram the device with.

As per argument 3, the Examiner disagrees. Gates teaches reading a key value and comparing the key value with a predefined key (see paragraph bridging columns 2 and 3). Gates teaches reading data in a shift register, which was previously input into the system and stored. The value in the shift register is compared with a predetermined value, and the result

Art Unit: 2182

of the comparison is a basis for determining whether or not the configuration data should be updated (see lines 1-16 of column 3). These teachings incorporated into the combination of Egbert and Chieng (i.e. determining from a header whether or not to update default values) yields the applicant's claimed invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eron J. Sorrell whose telephone number is 571 272-4160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Huynh can be reached on 571-272-4147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/805,233

Art Unit: 2182

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EJS August 20, 2007

> KIM HUYNH SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

> > 8/20/07